



2-208.44
1017
FERNALD
100 7-0007
OCT 3 9 55 AM '97
OCT 02 1997
REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:
SRF-5J

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 5
77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD
CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

Mr. Johnny W. Reising
United States Department of Energy
Feed Materials Production Center
P.O. Box 398705
Cincinnati, Ohio 45239-8705

RE: Area 2, Phase 1 Site
Preparation Design RTC

Dear Mr. Reising:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) has completed its review of the United States Department of Energy's (U.S. DOE) Responses to Comments (RTC) on the Area 2, Phase 1, site preparation design package for the inactive flyash pile, southfield, and active flyash pile.

U.S. DOE has addressed several of U.S. EPA's previous comments, however several unresolved issues remain. Specifically:

- RTC 24: Although U.S. EPA concurs that a 4-inch diameter drain is more than adequate to handle the volume of water from the 3/4 post hydrant, a 4-inch diameter drain may not be adequate to drain all storm water from the vehicle wash areas. This additional flow may be excessive for the drain and the oil/water separator as shown in the design drawings.
- RTC 25: The concern still remains that inflow of flood water from Paddy's Run into retention basin 1 could occur through the retention basin 1 overflow structure because the overflow elevation for retention basin 1 is 538.5 feet above mean sea level and the interpolated Paddy's Run water level is 539.1 feet above mean seal level during a 25-year, 24-hour storm event.
- The text of "Evaluation of the Potential Peak Stages in Paddy's Run During Storm Events at Cross Sections Close to the Proposed Retention Basin No. 1" states that results from cross sections D-D and E-E were linearly interpolated to estimate water levels at cross sections C'-C', B'-B', and A'-A'. However, the text does not provide justification for performing linear interpolation to determine water levels at cross sections C'-C', B'-B', and A'-A'. This justification must be provided to evaluate the validity of the linear interpolation method. In addition, Figure 7 does not define x-axis increments.

-2-

Further, it should be noted that not all of the design drawings are included in the design package. Piping and instrument, and electrical drawings were not included.

Therefore, U.S. EPA disapproves the Area 2, Phase 1, site preparation design package until the above issues are adequately addressed. U.S. EPA will more thoroughly review and comment on all Area 2, Phase 1 activities when the integrated remedial design plan is submitted for the area.

Please contact me at (312) 886-0992 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



James A. Saric
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Section
SFD Remedial Response Branch #2

cc: Tom Schneider, OEPA-SWDO
Bill Murphie, U.S. DOE-HDQ
John Bradburne, FERMCO
Terry Hagen, FERMCO
Tom Walsh, FERMCO